

REMARKS

1. In the above-captioned Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 8, 9, and 11-13. The Examiner objected to claims 4 and 16. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Arnold (U.S. Patent No. 1,438,937). Claims 2 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) given Arnold in view of Mallas (U.S. Patent No. 4,850,315). Claims 2 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) given Arnold in view of Yates (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,898). Claims 2-3 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) given Arnold in view of Knickerbocker (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,805). Claims 5-7 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) given Arnold in view of Knickerbocker and further in view of Perez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,273,042). These rejections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

2. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Arnold. Claims 2 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) given Arnold in view of Mallas. Claims 2 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) given Arnold in view of Yates. Claims 2-3 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) given Arnold in view of Knickerbocker. Claims 5-7 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) given Arnold in view of Knickerbocker and further in view of Perez.

Claims 1 and 14, as amended above set forth that at least a part of the pivot rod head pivots, or is pivotable, within the pivot rod cup *while retained by a pivot rod retainer*. Arnold does not teach or suggest a retainer. Mallas does not teach or suggest a pivot rod, including a pivot rod that has a pivot rod body that pivots in a pivot rod chamber of a valve bridge as set forth in the claims, but rather a push rod which is not a pivot rod, nor does Mallas teach or suggest a retainer that retains a pivot rod while a part of the pivot rod head pivots within the pivot rod cup. Both Yates and Knickerbocker teach a rocker ball that is fixed to the rocker arm and a retainer that retains the rocker ball to an elephants foot. Thus, none of the references teaches or suggests that at least a part of the pivot rod head pivots, or is pivotable, within the pivot rod cup *while retained by a pivot rod retainer*, as set forth in independent claims 1 and 14 as amended above.

With respect to dependent claims 2, 20, and 21, none of the references cited teaches or suggests that the pivot rod retainer retains the pivot rod to the valve bridge. Yates and Knickerbocker retain a rocker ball to an elephant's foot, which is not a valve bridge. Mallas retains a push rod to a cylinder block, which is also not a valve bridge.

Thus, the claims of the present invention are not taught or suggested by Arnold, Mallas, Yates, Knickerbocker, and/or Perez. Combining these references fails to teach or yield the invention as claimed. The combination of these references fails to teach or suggest all the elements of the claims. Further, one of skill in the art would not be motivated to make such a combination. Therefore, the present invention is not obvious in light of any combination of Arnold, Mallas, Yates, Knickerbocker, and/or Perez. Hence, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 14 may be passed to allowance.

Furthermore, claims 2-7, 9, 11-13, and 15-21 are dependent upon an independent claim that is shown to be allowable. For all these reasons, the dependent claims are themselves allowable.

3. No new subject matter is introduced by the amendments to the above claims or the addition of the new claims. The above change to claim 16 corrects a typographical error.

4. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication may advance the prosecution of the present application. Notice of allowance of claims 1-9 and 11-21 is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 23, 2004

By: Susan L. Lukasik
Susan L. Lukasik
Registration No. 35,261
Attorney for Applicant
International Engine Intellectual Property
Company, LLC
Voice: (630) 753-2172
Fax: (630) 753-3982